Park Excellence into the 90's

Parks Branch Conference
Proceedings 1989

Manitoba

PARKS BRANCH CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS

1989

April 1990

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		PAGE
1.0	SUMMARY	4
2.0	CONFERENCE AGENDA	7
3.0	EVALUATION RESPONSES	8
4.0	OPENING REMARKS - GORDON PROUSE, DIRECTOR	10
5.0	BUILDING COMMITMENT AND MORALE	20
6.0	FUTURE DIRECTIONS	26
7.0	PANELISTS' PRESENTATIONS	
	7.1 Jim Johnston	29
	7.2 Dave Witty	29
	7.3 Hubert Meseman	34
	7.4 Mark Searle	40
		46
8.0	FOLLOW-UP	53
APPENDIX I - ORGANIZING VOLUNTEERS		54

1.0 SUMMARY

The conference provided a vast amount of information from theoretical subject matter presented by Doctoral researchers to practical field experience delivered by our own staff. While all presentations added greatly to the success of the conference, space does not allow reporting and duplication of all of the material. Therefore, the Director's presentation, our special speakers who presented at the panel discussion, and the material contributed by all staff on the two plenary sessions "Commitment and Morale" and "Parks and the Future", constitute these proceedings.

The Director provided a review of the previous year's achievements. This included response to resolutions of the past conference, branch re-organization and providing improved services to the public. He also highlighted items from a report entitled "State Parks in a New Era" and, finally, emphasized the need to produce a Parks Discussion Paper to provide a vision for the '90's.

For the "Commitment and Morale" session, all staff contributed a wide range of "morale" issues that were personal to departmental in scope. They identified recognition for work, staffing, goal setting, branch integrity and a host of miscellaneous items that call variously for personal to senior management action.

The group's Ideas for Future Directions were not ranked. A sample of thoughts expressed included researching clients, developing constituencies, providing sustainable experiences, alternative funding, improving public profile, balancing consumption and preservation and permitting non-government groups to submit briefs for Parks' "Discussion Paper." Many other good ideas were presented.

The four members of the panel all provided insight for us.

Jim Johnston's concerns for Parks were expressed as four challenges for the future. The first challenge was maintaining interest in a strong parks

program, despite the growing interest in sustainable development. Secondly, recognizing and implementing a parks mandate that integrates the ideas of protection of the natural and cultural environments. This was particularly noted as a problem where two agencies have individual responsibility in this regard. The third challenge was not to get bogged down with doing business with ourselves. Parks must focus on action rather than just on exchanging information. The fourth challenge was expeditiously completing the system plan with new land designations, because land demands will increase in the future.

Dave Witty identified several concerns. Parks must address future concerns for the benefit of future generations. Parks is too willing to compromise and planning must be more holistic. We must see sustainable development as an opportunity and, finally, we now have a new multi-cultural market to properly address.

He stated that several principles we should use to address these above concerns are that parks are "irreplaceable", we can "substitute" sites for sensitive areas and, lastly, once biology is changed, it may well be "irreversible."

Hubert Meseman addressed marketing and said aside from Manitoba park users, we are now in a globally competitive market, but we are not adequately funding marketing and advertising. He provided a user profile that included shorter holidays, interest in the environment and culture, diverse ethnic users and an aging population. His closing note identified the need for developing the shoulder season use.

Mark Searle emphasized the need to address concern about the environment, while remembering we are dealing mostly with urban people. He also stated "we", society is largely inward looking, and that we are living in an era of transience, changing values and, perhaps, have not taken adequate heed of works such as Toffler's "Future Shock". Parks must ensure the public is well informed, recognize that the aging population in Manitoba is here, keep control of parks in the public sector and recognize that using economics as a "raison

d'être" will lead to a less healthy system. Lastly, Parks must work energetically to complete its system of protected lands.

2.0 CONFERENCE AGENDA

Day 1	
Introduction	Gordon Prouse, Director
Senior Executive Comments	Dale Stewart, D. M. Richard C. Goulden, A.D.M.
Parks Manager Presentation	
What Builds Commitment and Morale	Gordon Prouse
Morale Building	
- Plenary Session & Workshop	
Parks Manager Presentation	
Bear Pit	
What Builds a Winning Team	Paul Robson
Parks Manager Presentation	
Day 2	
Interpretive Presentation	
"What are the Challenges for the Future?"	
- Panel, Plenary Session & Workshop	Jim Johnston Dave Witty Hubert Meseman Mark Searle
Antigua Experience	Roger Schroeder
Bloodvein Archaeological Study Presentation	Rick Wilson
Day 3	
Interpreter's Presentation	
Parks Manager Presentation	
Evaluation & Closing	

3.0 EVALUATION RESPONSES

An evaluation of the conference was provided to solicit opinion and to give us a means for improving similar conferences in the future. The response allowed for four degrees of assessment on the criteria (a) to (g), and an open comment section. The suggestions provided much useful opinion.

The rating system and a compilation of responses are below.

1. Please rate the following agenda topics:

   EX - Excellent

   VG - Very Good

   G - Good

   P - Poor

		EX	VG	G	P	TOTAL
a.	Bear Pits	4	24	6	1	35
b.	Panel Discussion - as a concept	20	11	3		34
	- specific information	15	11	7		33
c.	Effectiveness of group discussions	3	10	19	1	33
d.	Guest Speakers	15	14	6		35
e.	Social Activities	19	10	1	1	31
f.	Length of Agenda	5	12	15		32
g.	Lakeside Camp - rooms	5	7	16		28
	- meals	17	11	6		34
	- facilities	9	16	6		31

Suggested Improvements and Pertinent Comments

- Consider establishing an "employee of the year" award for outstanding efforts.
- Invite branch representatives to attend with Regional Services, Historic Resources, Wildlife, etc.
- Free evenings were great.
- Lakeside camp was excellent primarily because we had the run of the place.
- Sound system was terrific.
- Proper follow-up and some demonstration of action by senior management is essential, otherwise all momentum from this conference will be lost.

- Separate group discussions because it was difficult to concentrate.
- Panel discussion with Parks/Regional Services representatives (policy and deliver arms to discuss pertinent issues).
- Good variety of panelists from different disciplines. Consider involvement of commercial concessions and some special interest groups.
- Utilize panelists as group discussion leaders following presentations.
- More product orientation to group sessions.
- Short (5 minute) presentations from a variety of staff to reflect projects they are involved in. Greater focus on park programs in progress.
- Our group was great, especially Bob Brooks.
- Use a different format and subject material for next conference.
- Programming for last day of any conference should be kept light, as was done this year.
- The variety of opinions and presentations by panelists was good food for thought.
- Consider holding conference in early fall, "remember September", so that outdoor activities can be part of agenda.
- Social activities were well planned and helped break up agenda.
- A facility with a gym/in a park/at a time of year when we could do some outdoor stuff.
- Organizing committee did a wonderful job!
- Social activities - Excellent ++. (Prouse was excellent as well.)
- Bear pits should not be dominated by a few that wish to utilize the forum to get something off their "philosophical" chest.
- Bear pit session with other Directors within Natural Resources.
- Dedicate more time to bear pits.

4.0 OPENING REMARKS - GORDON PROUSE, DIRECTOR

There's an old proverb that says, the only time a whale is in danger of being harpooned, is when he rises to the surface and spouts off. Well, in my view, the true test of success at this meeting, is just to see how many times you can get yourself harpooned. We want you to adopt the attitude of saying what you think and saying what's on your mind. You don't have to give a damn whether anyone wants to hear it or not. If you feel like saying it, say it. You have a tremendous opportunity in front of you because you've got the departmental executive that have joined us, and they're just eager to hear what you've got to say and think about how things have been going, so please take advantage of that.

I view this meeting as being the most important meeting that I will have attended since coming to Manitoba. We're actually going to get down to the business of discussing managing parks and how we must function as an agency to accomplish managing parks. It's exciting for me to think that we've finally reached the point of getting ourselves in a position of saying "let's figure out what we should be doing, what's important and how do we have to change." Now we've spent a lot of time doing other things in the past year and a half, but we're at the point where we can actually do this now, and I think many of us are eager to do this activity. It's an opportunity to talk to people about what they think we should be doing, and to have a public review of the new role for Manitoba parks in contributing to a better Manitoba.

In the report that Bill Watkins recently prepared for the F.P.P.C., it indicated that Manitoba was the most permissive park agency in the country. Well, when we go and talk to the public, I guess we're going to hear about that because I don't think everyone wants us to be the most permissive park agency in the country. It's going to initiate the process of rewriting an Act. Most of us will consider ourselves extremely lucky to get an opportunity to do that once in our career, and that opportunity is before us. We have to manage in a period of reduced resources and, in a sense, this will assist us. We should look at this as something that's beneficial, because not only does it force us to

focus on what we think is important, but it forces us to think of new ways of doing business. I want to show you an overhead. This talks about creating a new vision for parks. Creating a new vision for parks, far from competing with the existing system, can help attract funds to take care of its backlog of needs. Funding is more likely to be made available to dynamic systems where officials are open to changing values and needs. Our reluctance to take on new burdens is understandable in the face of pinched budgets; simply working harder is not likely to generate the support Parks needs. I think that is very topical for today's management challenges within Parks, or, for that matter, other agencies as well.

I want to talk a little bit about how far I think we've come in almost two years. I'm going to mention some personal things as well. I felt really awkward when I first arrived in Manitoba Parks, and for a good reason. I didn't know much about Manitoba Parks and I didn't know much about Parks at all when I got here. I had no idea how diverse Parks management was. I didn't know that we were going to end up running a little municipality in townsites. I didn't know that we were always in the business of resource management and not just one resource. We talk about wildlife, fisheries, forestry, recreation, all sorts of things. We've got cultural heritage resources as well. There is a tremendous diversity in Parks. In fact, I don't think there is any other discipline that gets as much diversity as Parks does.

I didn't have a good appreciation of how controversial anything you did in Parks could become. We're always walking the line. We make people angry, it doesn't matter what we do. We do something for a hunter, we tick off a naturalist and vice versa. It's hard to appreciate this complexity if you're not within Parks. The political realities of Parks management is that it is a controversial area and we have to do a better job and explain <u>that</u> to people so they appreciate it, so they just don't think that we're not doing a great job "because there's so much controversy." That controversy is just a fact of life with Parks. Now clearly this was a little frightening for me. But, also I realized that this could be the most interesting and challenging job of my career. It included a whole bunch of things that I liked to do. I came from

a fisheries' background. I've had involvement in wildlife. I enjoy recreation. So it was interesting and I thought that it could be a lot of fun. And I intend it to be a lot of fun, particularly during our social events in the evenings at this conference.

Often when a new person is employed to lead a section or branch or division, they find their leadership challenged, and have to expend a lot of energy finding ways of asserting themselves and earning your stripes. Well, I was fortunate in coming to Manitoba Parks because I didn't have to undergo any of that nonsense. This branch went out of its way to make sure that I had a running start. They didn't want any rookie director acting as an anchor. So people gave me as much help as possible so as to arm me with the information that I needed to interact effectively with people and I really appreciate that. This may not appear to have been an important activity but to me it was a very significant action taken by the branch. Put simply, it told me that this branch was eager to function as a team. They would willingly work together to get the job of managing parks done effectively. That was a very pleasing thing for me to observe.

I'm going to go back a little bit and talk about the 1987 conference. Although I wasn't a participant, I have had an opportunity to review the report. One of the first handouts I received after arriving in the branch was the report from the '87 conference. Also, it was the focal point of our first team meeting. So, it's been put to good use, and it has served as a valuable aid in focussing discussion about where we should be going in Parks. We looked at every one of those resolutions. Not every one of those resolutions has been addressed, but we also put together a few fact sheets and distributed it to people about things we thought had been actioned. And as you go back and review them today, you'll see that more of them have been actioned.

In comparing the goals of the '87 conference and today's goals, we find that staff morale and future directions are common to both of those conferences. The reason they're still on the agenda is, not because they weren't dealt with, but rather, those are topics that, in my mind, require constant attention and

should always be on the agenda. A major difference in today's conference is that not only are we going to philosophize on the future direction of this branch and the new role of parks, but also, we are going to write it down. And we are going to express it in the form of a discussion paper and eventually a new Act. So be assured that not only is this going to be a thought provoking experience, but also a very practical one, because we are leaving here with the initial form and content of some products.

I want to deal with restructuring the branch. The choices I had to make when I first arrived were either we undertake a structural change and then look at the vision, or we look at the vision first and then change the organization to meet the vision. Now from past experience in discussion with some of my colleagues in British Columbia, who I might add are very well versed in the subject of re-organizations, experience seems to indicate that a new head of an organization has from 9-12 months to make any substantive changes. After that, the organization is less receptive to change, and the head has become caught up in the everyday affairs of the branch and no longer has the will to make a change. So, for those reasons, I chose to make the structural changes first. But, this is the only decision that I made alone. After that, it was all the management team working together.

I can't leave this point without mentioning the positive attitude, not only that the management team exhibited in all the deliberations in restructuring, but also the positive attitude everyone in the branch adopted in implementing the new organizational structure. I must admit that the results, even over the short period of time the changes have been in place, have by far exceeded my expectations. Everyone within the branch is enthusiastically taking on their new role, and we're seeing results. I hear comments like, "Parks is beginning to figure out where it's going. I can finally figure out who I should call to get an answer to something. We're getting action out of Parks in a short period of time. Boy, it sure is nice to have those Parks Managers in the regional offices. The attitude of Parks staff seems better. They're happier and they're more enthusiastic." Now these are all unsolicited comments that

we're getting. They're all from different people. But collectively, they indicate to me that things are moving in the right direction.

Now I'm going to leave organization for a while, and I want to talk a bit about management and state parks. There is a publication that's recently been put out by the States, it's a three volume report and it's called, "States Parks in a New Era." It was discussed at the F.P.P.C. in Regina, and it was so topical that the F.P.P.C. ordered copies for each agency. I'm going to order more copies because I think it is a very valuable tool for what we're facing now. It became clear that the States were wrestling with the same issues and facing similar challenges to ourselves. I want to spend a few minutes overviewing what they found and how it compares to our situation. They surveyed all of the state park directors and they gave them a very detailed questionnaire. A student summarized all of the responses to that questionnaire in three publications. I'm going to mention some of the innovations that they reported as being very pleased with. And when I mention these, note how many of these things we're involved with.

These are things that they thought they had done successfully.

<u>Funding</u>.

1. We have significantly increased user fees.
2. We've established a park foundation to encourage land and other private donations.
3. The state has floated a recreational bond issue for the first time, or floated an innovative one.
4. We've tapped new revenue sources and dedicated or earmarked receipts for acquisition and development of state park lands. And to be sure, the States have an easier time with earmarking funds, and that kind of thing, than we do in Canada. But we're talking about some of these things right now.

Visitation and Visitor Services.

1. We're marketing parks to increase out-of-state visitation.
2. We're making significantly more use of non-profit groups and volunteers to provide visitor services.
3. We're increasing and diversifying interpretive services.
4. We're building facilities to increase revenue for parks.
5. We've established more concessions in parks.

Politics.

1. The state has stepped up promotion of parks for economic development.
2. We've taken specific steps to gain access to the governor.
3. State or private groups are working to build stronger state-wide support for state parks.

Those are just some of the things that they felt they were very pleased with. As you know, we're involved in many of those same activities.

I've got one more overhead here that talks about the issues ranked by order of importance. These are the top 20 issues. You will see how many of those listed we also feel are issues today. Wherever you see "states", you can read "province."

1. We need more money.
2. Funds are seriously impeding the system, neglected facilities need repair.
3. Some units are crowded and some are under-used.

There are many, many, many things on this list that we're involved with. We don't have to re-invent the wheel, we can learn some things from our colleagues south of the border with respect to management.

Now I want to talk a little bit about the "discussion paper" and the "Act", and why we are thinking about rewriting the Act. I'll tell you some of

the reasons why I think we should be looking at rewriting the Act. When I read it, I don't get a very good sense about what Manitoba Parks are all about. In other words, it doesn't express the philosophy of park management in Manitoba. It expresses a few motherhood statements, but it doesn't really give you a sense of belonging to that Act and it being special in any particular way. It doesn't appear to be alive. It's more of an administrative document than something that you can look to for management direction. At times, it's too restrictive in addressing user activities. There is very little mention of anything to do with commercial concessions or economic development or anything of that nature. And on the other hand, it's too permissive in allowing extractive activities. It suggests that extraction will occur with conditions, rather than extraction activities "will not occur unless." There's little reference to system planning or, in fact, the hierarchy that we have of management planning. There's no reference to funding mechanisms or trusts. People didn't have to look at that before, so it's no surprise there isn't any mention of that. We've got to look at that now. We're talking about rationalizing fees and yet there's no authority in the Act or reference to municipal taxation. We can't move on some things.

There should be some reference to the classification of parks, something that embraces the wilderness concept. There should be some vehicle in this Act that would introduce more of a commitment by government, by having Cabinet approve the system plan and perhaps management plans. The Parks Branch isn't even recognized, the least they should do is recognize us as a management agency. There is not a lot of accountability in this Act. Perhaps we could introduce the concept of a report to the legislature on the status of parks every four or five years. There isn't any formal appeal mechanisms. I think that would help us out a lot. There is just a myriad of miscellaneous housekeeping that we could attend to within the Act, so, to me, there's lots of reasons to look at this Act, but in order to look at the Act, I think we have to look at a discussion paper first.

Okay, what are my expectations for this meeting? Well, I'd like to make sure it enhances our internal working relationships. I want everyone to leave with a sense of being part of a team. I want us to begin to formulate a

vision for the '90's and a new direction. I want us to rough out a table of contents to the Parks discussion paper. I want to develop a plan of action for the new Parks Act. I want us to determine what products will be produced, and who we are producing them for - who's the audience; how many audiences are we producing these things for.

Now, in closing, I want to quickly review some of the things that I've observed that I think have been very substantive accomplishments of the Branch. Obviously, I think that restructuring the branch has been a very substantive undertaking. But, getting involved in that process, there's a lot of other things that have fallen out of it. For example, we've got all sorts of position reclassifications in the works right now. I think we found that Parks people were not fairly classified, generally speaking, as compared to their counterparts in some of the other branches. And we took some steps to rectify those situations. Specifically, we've had some success with the Parks Managers and the secretaries. There's a bunch in the works right now. I'm very optimistic that we'll have equal success with those others. The reason I'm optimistic is that I think we've developed a very good working relationship with, not only our own Human Resources Branch, but also the Civil Service Commission. I think we've had a very fair hearing with them. We've had an opportunity to provide a complete overview of the Branch, and then deal specifically with particular positions. So I can't see how we could have had a fairer hearing. I think they have to know how the Branch works and they have to know why we undertook these exercises.

We've had about 22 people enter this branch in the past two years. Twenty-two people! That's a lot. We've brought improved working relationships with Regional Services, and I believe we also have improved working relationships with the other branches. We've got improved working relationships with the Department of Tourism and the Department of Environment. We spent a great deal of time and effort and came up with new sewage guidelines. It was a very controversial issue. A lot of people worked hard and for a long time and I think we've met with a lot of success.

We spent a lot of time looking at divestiture and I think we see that as an opportunity to re-allocate some funds into higher priority areas. We implemented the Current Parks Issues statements. It seems like a little thing, but it sure reduces the workload when the House opens and you don't have to redo a whole bunch of those things, they're all up to date anyway. It keeps everyone informed and advised as to what's going on. We've got a marketing strategy. We can really move on that one. We've got an interpretive strategy. And you'll see in those slides that I showed about the states, those are two things that are pretty important. We're looking at a new pricing strategy and a rationalization of our fee structure. We've made some headway on I.M.G.'s and management plans.

I think the Federal-Provincial Parks Council is working more as a team, and not coming to the annual meeting as representatives of respective jurisdictions, but are coming there to work as a part of a national team. I see out of that great opportunities for regional surveys, market research and so forth. We're going to be presenting a paper at the Minister's conference on the role of Parks in sustainable development, and Manitoba is going to write that paper.

We've got a whole bunch of computers in the branch. We've implemented some new technology. Now, they don't all work, but at least we've got something we can fix. We've got a redesigned office. We've got people who work in a section all together now. We had them scattered throughout the branch before. We've got a new friendly lease for our commercial concessionaires. I think we're going to have another new one. We started work on the Hecla Village revitalization. I think we're beginning to get a hand on Atikaki Wilderness Park and its management. We've undertaken a review of the Licensing Advisory Committee. We've got a maintenance management program in place that will lead us into a risk management policy. We're part of the discussions about a national park in Churchill. We've reduced the backlog of vacation home lot leases substantively. We've been able to access some special funds from Treasury Board to do some needed things in terms of maintenance. We got two Ministers out to visit parks in Manitoba. We've got a draft Heritage Resources Strategy. We've

got people to attend conferences. We've been to the F.P.P.C. conferences, we've been to the Hinton course, some have been to Newfoundland, others to Great Britain, Calgary, Ottawa. We've got people in Parks going to conferences and talking to their colleagues now. And finally, but not least, we are beginning to control rowdyism.

We accomplished all of this, not really knowing what we're supposed to be doing yet, over two years. Amazing. Just imagine how deadly we'll be once we get our act together. Thank you.

5.0 BUILDING COMMITMENT AND MORALE

To respond to this subject, groups of about five were established. Everyone was given an opportunity to identify their concerns about morale, and each workshop group priorized their top concerns. Where overlap occurred, an item was not listed more than once.

The five priority concerns of each group are listed, followed by a miscellaneous identification of other concerns. There is no ranking of these points.

Priorities

Characteristics that build commitment and morale are:

1. Success.
   The branch must evaluate what its successful achievements are and what the personal and branch contributions have been to attain this success. When success is achieved, there should be personal recognition, even if it is as little as a pat on the back, as well as the criticism that results from failure. Each individual, from the washroom maintenance crew to the Director, must know how his/her contribution has been received and made to realize the importance they play in the success of the parks system; from field operations to head office.
2. Communications.
   As an organization grows and becomes more dispersed, effective up and down communication is essential. It is important that staff know the rationale of senior executive decisions. There must be clear communication of information about tasks, plans, projects within the branch and between branches in the department. Employees should be kept up to date with what the branch generally is doing.
3. Training/Knowledge and the Tools to Do It.
   There must be adequate and regular opportunity for employees to upgrade.
4. Mutual respect, understanding and co-operation are necessary.

5. Clear leadership and the confidence in that leader that is being gained by the demonstration of his or her abilities and by the support of the employee.
6. The Branch must develop its own statement of purpose or roles and missions statement and, although the senior executive may ask for modifications, once these are achieved, the senior executive must "be seen to support" that statement.
7. There must be better management of the workload - if everything is a crisis, then nothing is a crisis; at times, we have to say no, we can't achieve more.
8. There should be a better fit between the effort and the final product. If we spend three years on a plan, it should not be overturned on a whim.
9. A few more spontaneous social outings would help bring staff together.
10. Management must recognize and impress upon all staff that we are here working for the public. We may sometimes forget this and other issues take priority, i.e. increasing revenue rather than satisfying public needs and wants.
11. We must build an understanding that we are part of a larger department, and our roles must be consistent with the department's purpose, and also understand that our department has a particular relationship with all other departments as well.
12. Once management initiates projects, we must follow through on these projects with as little compromise of our principles as possible, i.e. with respect to plan approval. Maintain the integrity of the branch. We should do what our mandate states. We should not hedge on the decisions.
13. There should be incentives for a job well done. These could be obtained by use of a suggestion box, opportunities for working on special projects, travel to conferences, writing about those achievements in the Resource Focus news, or by plaques. Recognition should not be the "loading on" of more work, which is sometimes the case.
14. The basic needs of the branch must be monitored when we are filling positions. If a regulation's person leaves, then we must replace him/her with a regulation's person. When a planner leaves, then we should replace

him/her with a planner if this is the need and requirement to meet branch operating strength.

15. Vacant positions should be filled without delay.
16. There should be appropriate staff consultation and input.
17. There should be fairness in personnel management, and in ministerial and executive intervention.

Miscellaneous Comments on Commitment and Morale

Commitment and morale would be encouraged by the following:

1. Improving the public perception of civil servants.
2. Making employees aware that their job is important.
3. Clearly understanding the purpose of the parks system and through clear direction.
4. Happy people want to do their job well.
5. Employees should have responsibility and also authority.
6. There needs to be a willingness to continue to learn.
7. The job should be challenging.
8. There should be a diversity of learning opportunity.
9. There has to be an understanding on both sides of any discussion that any issue has to be addressed from the point of view of the larger picture, as well as from the detailed focus.
10. Employee must recognize his/her own role and the role that other employees contribute to achievement of overall park purposes. There must be good co-ordination of the Parks Branch staff.
11. Team work is more important than creating any single star.
12. Get rid of deadwood.
13. There should be fair treatment for all staff.
14. There should be a stronger corporate identity and symbol.
15. There should be faster decision-making.
16. There must be support from one's immediate supervisor.
17. There should be a quicker turnaround on projects from superiors once they are forwarded up.

18. We must confirm that the Branch is to be taken seriously. Other agency activities in parks should only occur with Branch consideration and acceptance.
19. Staff must develop a professional ethic that transcends branch boundaries.
20. There should be more of a think-tank approach to group projects.
21. We must re-affirm each other's job roles rather than cast doubts upon them.
22. We should leave politics to the politicians; Branch staff are essentially technical specialists.
23. All staff are professionals, and they should be consulted for more involvement when it is appropriate.
24. There needs to be recognition of excellence.
25. There needs to be much better provision of technology.
26. We must attempt to match skills and tasks.
27. We must put emphasis on working as a team rather than as an organization with rank levels. Courteousness and respect will assist in this team emphasis.
28. There should be a strong and clear Parks Act developed by the branch.
29. There should be clear and effective orientation for new staff, i.e. information on the definition of staff positions, office policy, introductions to staff, contract benefits, and opportunities to visit parks.
30. There needs to be training and development opportunities for head office and field staff.
31. There needs to be regular monthly section meetings for communication and for beefs and bouquets.
32. There should be a clear identification of priorities so that all projects can be completed.
33. There should be clear communication when political priorities change.
34. Management should be reasonable with respect to the time allotments and staff support required to achieve tasks.
35. There should be a clear priorizing of tasks and duties.
36. We should place, before the public, the tasks and accomplishments for which the branch is responsible. The public is not presently informed, nor do they understand our mandate.

37. At year end, we should be able to demonstrate a balanced level of achievement that directly relates to our mandate.
38. Feedback from the supervisor is required regarding one's personal performance.
39. There should be management sensitivity to staffing concerns.
40. Parks Branch employees should be able to contribute firsthand to the mission statement draft document.
41. Each employee should have a job description, and the work expected of that employee should fall within that description. If the employee does not have the skills, then opportunity for learning the needed skills should be made available.
42. An employee should not be placed in a position where he/she may not have the necessary skills or may not have the desire to work and achieve in a particular field.
43. We need to develop organizational consistency. That is, we need to have Regional Parks Managers report to one chief.
44. The branch should demonstrate and develop a system which will give first consideration to existing employees and their career paths, prior to filling any existing or new position in the branch with people from outside.
45. Managers should be sensitive to existing employee needs and career paths, invested time and effort when they are considering "parachuting" someone new into the branch.
46. Staff require feedback on performance.
47. There should be recognition for ideas and work performance, i.e. employee of the month.
48. There needs to be an adequate form for staff to express opinions.
49. We need to facilitate the efficiency and effectiveness of the bureaucracy.
50. There should be Branch incentives such as trust funds and target revenues identified.
51. There should be staff training and development.
52. There should be clearly defined job descriptions.
53. Rationale should be provided when there is ministerial intervention.
54. There should be fairness in personnel dealings.
55. Personnel management should include complimenting staff when it is due.

56. Head office staff should be exposed to field operations, and operations staff should be exposed to head office operations.
57. Mutually agreed to objectives should be achieved by the delivery arm of Parks.
58. There should be employee incentives.
59. The Branch mandate should be defined and developed with staff input.
60. There should be staff input on issues management.
61. There should be good intra-branch communication.
62. Employee comfort should be considered in terms of a decent coffee room, work space and ergonomics.
63. There should be visible management.

6.0 FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Much of this conference has been about the future of Parks. Our senior executive described the future, the four panelists dealt with it in some detail. We have had the benefit of that and have all made our own contributions. It is expected that some of what was contributed will take more precise form in the Parks' Discussion Paper. The comments are very informative, the strategies for implementation may be considerably more difficult.

Group's Recommendations (No ranking is implied.)

1. Identify client groups, engage in dialogue and obtain their opinion about the purposes of parks, and use this to develop a discussion paper.
2. Complete the system plan within the allocated time frames.
3. Use the co-operative approach with special groups and agencies such as Tourist Branch, N.G.O.'s, tribal councils and ethnic groups.
4. Implement a marketing procedure or study.
5. Strike a better balance between consumption and preservation in parks, i.e. wilderness and natural parks.
6. Develop a support constituency by using education and media to ensure that the identified public image of parks is one of special places, and that politicians recognize the value of this image-making, and of parks as special places.
7. Define, for ourselves, very clearly, what a park is and what our main products are. Identify what they should do as opposed to W.M.A.'s, etc. Define where we are now and what do we need to change.
8. Define who parks is serving and research who the users are, how they use the parks, what the trends are, and what the barriers/enemies are to achieving the experience.
9. Manage the conflicts from other users, particularly resource extraction users.
10. How do we lead?
    - we show by example.
    - use school programs and education.

- put an emphasis on research regarding markets and trends, etc.
- use communication such as the mass media and in working practices.
- at the source with industry, connections and other branches.

11. Provide sustainable experiences.
    - put the larger profile projects in winning situations.
    - use our leadership in our areas of expertise, i.e. Hecla Village, Tie Creek, Spruce Woods Interpretive Centre.
12. Manage the parks systems with integrity and according to the classification definitions.
13. Look for alternative means and sources of funding for park services.
14. Look for alternative means of providing services.
15. Build a park support constituency by designing it into the education system.
16. Search for a better understanding of user groups.
17. Create a future Parks Act that has teeth and enforce the regulations.
18. If there is a change in government, there is a potential decrease in privatization.
19. There is an increasing need for near urban parks.
20. There will be a larger early retirement population.
21. Focus efforts on core services with reliance on others to provide consumer services on the periphery of the park.
22. Work with the education system to increase our profile.
23. Increase marketing.
24. Increase interpretation.
25. Identify needs and wants of new Canadians and non-caucasians.
26. Demonstrate some commitment to completion of the system plan.
27. For water access parks and family orientation parks - "remember September". Specify market facilities.
28. Enshrine regulations in legislation.
29. There will be an increase day use resulting from a decrease in campers.
30. Identify clearly our role.
31. There will be a decrease in hunting as a result of public pressure and an increase in non-consumptive and appreciative viewing uses of wildlife.

32. Present a discussion paper and then sort and minimize the issues prior to preparing a draft act.
33. Request briefs from interested groups and related government organizations, and then develop a discussion paper.
34. An outside organization such as an advisory committee or the Manitoba Environmental Council to run hearings on a discussion paper and, in which, Parks Branch is a participant.

7.0 PANELISTS' PRESENTATIONS

The speakers invited to the conference were recognized as a highlight. They have had long, direct experience and/or academic competency. We may well recognize the applicability of their words. It remains for us to undertake what they emphasized or to indicate alternative reasoning.

7.1 Jim Johnston - Canadian Parks Service

I see the future as presenting a series of challenges. The first challenge is maintaining a strong program in parks. Some people would say there's never been a greater expression of support for environmental matters. We talk about sustainable development. We talk about an environmental agenda where all facets of the economy and society would come together and work to have a type of development which can be sustained over the long term. We're talking about the level of interest on general environmental matters having never been higher. In fact, all kinds of research surveys show this, that people are willing to pay for environmental quality. They're willing to pay for environmental safeguards. But, in my view, that kind of movement is a great opportunity, but it also is a threat or is an issue. I feel what can happen is that, as the environmental movement widens and as people become more aware of environmental matters generally, that there is a risk that support will pull back or not be as strongly expressed for parks or protected areas. So, in other words, it would be a dilution of the support rather than act as a focussing of the support.

I think we are seeing some of those things already, for example, Manitoba Naturalists, which has long been a very strong advocate and supporter of Provincial Parks, National Parks, all kinds of protected areas, are now increasingly focussing their attention on urban issues, riverbank enhancement. That's not a bad thing, but those volunteer groups, those interest groups have only got so much energy, they've only got so much resources, and if they're focussing on those kinds of things in a general sense, recycling, riverbank enhancement, quality of life generally from an environmental perspective, it

means there's less support particularly for parks, for protected areas, for recreation areas.

In the same way, the environmental agenda, which is what it's been called nationally, or the concept of sustainable development, offers great opportunity. Parks as an activity or as a way of protecting areas is a very difficult sell, from a marketing point of view, in a concept where we have sustainable development, because national parks are the things done well in that concept. We don't have to say we have to change dramatically to make parks an example of the sustainable development or environmental agenda because this is what we have been doing all along. But it's not as though we can go and say we're going to spend $5 billion cleaning up the lower St. Lawrence River or it's not as though we're going to say we're going to have a major new initiative to clean up the arctic, or anything so dramatic. It's difficult to fire the public imagination to tell people what you're doing is what you've done all along and is really what you want to continue to do well. There is no crisis, there is no issue, there is no media circus associated with their continuously well done park programs, unlike recycling, solid waste management or global warming. So the challenge in my view will be to tie those types of things to the park movement, whether it be Provincial Parks which is your major concern here, or whether it be National Parks. As I say, these things are threats or issues, but they also can be turned into opportunities. But, there has to be a strategy, a method for dealing with them with some vision as to how we can make parks which are, in many ways, the most strong expression of an environmental movement of a sustainable development economy, some sort of continuing legacy for the future.

I think you have successfully dealt with this problem of potential waning of support, (and shown it) can be turned around and be used to harness energy to really support parks and protected areas. It has to be a conscious effort, it's not going to happen by itself. That's my first challenge or issue or opportunity.

The second challenge is one that I will call unity of mandate. I feel that one of the great challenges as well, one of the issues over the next period

of years for park agencies across the country, will be to bring the cultural side of heritage protection programs together with the protection of the natural environmental. I call it unity of mandate. In other words, our business is heritage protection, whether it be natural heritage as in Whiteshell or Nopiming or some of the northern parks in the shield country.

That's one side of the program. There's also a requirement to protect cultural resources, architectural built heritage, landscapes, significant works like the Pinawa Dam, things of that sort. There's great benefit to be gained by bringing those two sides of the program together. I know in Manitoba there are two separate departments; one department deals with heritage issues, "Heritage Resources", and has a specific focus on architectural heritage, archaeology, built heritage, preservation of things of that kind. And then, of course, there's the Provincial Parks Branch and the Department of Natural Resources with its emphasis on natural resources. I feel that we have to bring these closer together to try and make them a much stronger program. It's almost an artificial separation, or an administrative convenience the way we have things separated now between cultural resources protection and management, and natural resources protection.

Likewise, I think we have to pay more attention to cultural resource management in Provincial Parks. This is already being done, for example, in areas such as Hecla where, after getting rid of all the Icelandic settlements and Icelandic patterns in part, we're now in process of looking back at how we can introduce this as a major interpretive theme or a major important part of the landscape. It is the landscape we want to interpret, we want to get people understanding, that is "man and the landscape", it's also the landscape by itself. So I feel that's a challenge as opposed to a problem or a shortcoming. There is a lot of potential in that area in a variety of ways, perhaps through co-operative activities, perhaps, as I say, focussing as much on cultural resources and cultural issues in park interpretation as we do on the natural. The natural environment has always been used in some form, whether it be pre-contact, whether it be Native use, or whether it be European history we're talking about. So there is a variety of uses. The landscape, in fact, has

always had essentially some kind of use, and I think we have to recognize that in park management as well as in interpretation and planning.

The third challenge, perhaps less of an opportunity, is one that I'll call doing business with ourselves. I'm talking about the proliferation of processes and activities which don't protect resources, which don't deliver the services to the visitors, and which don't provide education or interpretation. It's typically an administrative overload. I believe, from my general knowledge, that Provincial Parks suffers less from this than does my agency. But, nonetheless, I still feel that it is a challenge and we have to try to streamline the process.

There's talk about strategic planning exercise in which we present our ultimate vision and goal, we say "this is how we're going to do it." The program delivers services to the public, to tourists, to residents of Manitoba, it also protects resources, it interprets resources, etc. All the good things that are in the dedication clause of the Act. But, we have to keep focussing on that and avoid the trap in this information society where we're exchanging information, we're talking with one another, we're doing business with ourselves, but we're not actually doing what our mandate tells us to do according to The Provincial Park Lands Act or, in my case, The National Parks Act. Too much information, not enough action. It prevents dollars and personnel resources from doing the work on resource protection and delivering programs and services. It kills morale because it becomes a paper load with no apparent benefit to why we're doing it or why it has to be done. It kills initiative and it results in things like lists and designations as opposed to real, solid, hard protection or park designation. If we're not vigilant or if you people are not vigilant, we run the risk of sapping the energy off the program, spinning it off into things that look like we're doing a lot but in reality we're not doing what we should be doing at all.

The fourth challenge is completing the system. There is a systems plan, there is a park designation system or classification, there's a very ambitious program that has been laid out for both the provincial and national

park programs. There has to be a major initiative to try and complete that system of parks in the next decade. We have to aggressively pursue that vision of what a provincial park system would be like as outlined in the recent publication on the systems plan. Of course, if we pay more attention to cultural resources as well as natural resource protection, then there's even more of a challenge. We have a systems plan for cultural resource management and, if we implement that, that is going to substantially increase the amount of work that has to be done to complete a system. This may be done; through actual land acquisition without any development as a method to hold land so that it doesn't get alienated with other uses, through co-operative and/or partner agreements, by building constituencies for other people like the Natural Conservancy of Canada who are actually getting involved in acquiring land for park purposes, or other means. As Mark Twain said, "they aren't making any more of it", when the land is gone, it's gone. It's very difficult to reverse, to take land that has been used or alienated in some form to make it back into Provincial Parks. It can be done, but it's a lot easier to get out there, stake one's claim and get the system completed before other uses occur which preclude designation as a provincial park or as a site.

Now, those are my four challenges. What does the Provincial Parks program represent? Well, obviously to me, it represents a complimentary program. I work in the national parks side of things. It's instructive to find out what the Provincial Parks system is doing. It adds to the stock of protected areas or to the areas which are part of a world system or global system of protected and managed areas. National Parks, Provincial Parks, it's the <u>standard</u> kind of component of a very important system, which will become increasingly important in future years. Provincial Parks perhaps shows us ways that we can do our own work, suggests novel approaches, suggests ways not to do things, in some cases. Because we talk about a system of parks, not only nationally, but also provincially, we can see some parks acting as a pressure-relief valve. In many cases, we have expectations that are made for national parks which we can't achieve, given our Act, mandate, and policy. However, we can say of the range of uses, national parks may do this, while other uses are accommodated within

Provincial Parks. That's a bit of a selfish role perspective of Provincial Parks, but nonetheless I think that it's one that exists.

Provincial Parks' role is also obviously protection of provincial heritage sites and areas of provincial significance. As a taxpayer of Manitoba, there's great benefit to the Provincial Parks system because of the tourism that it brings in. It earns foreign exchange from international visitors. Tourism is obviously a very important part of the economy, and is dependent upon park areas. It benefits the local people, residents of Winnipeg, people from The Pas or Thompson, whatever the case. Near urban parks particularly serve that function. As I mentioned, parks are a very good expression of sustainable development which has become an increasingly important area in world and national affairs. Parks are relevant to sustainable development and of value to me, not only as a professional working in the business, but also as an individual citizen. It is important to know that areas are being protected and set aside and well managed under a good steward such as the Provincial Parks Branch, even though I may never, in fact, visit those areas.

7.2 Dave Witty - Hilderman, Fehr, Witty Landscapers

I am not a pure park planner as a consultant, if I were I'd be starving. Out of necessity, but primarily out of interest, I wear a number of hats in the field. I look around though, and it's true that I did work on the Parks Act and actually I did write the classification system. That's when Birds Hill was known as Drysdale's Hill, George had not a grey hair on his head, and McFarland could play goal and not just talk about it. This is an interesting panel for me because I did hire Jim away from Manitoba to Parks Canada and then immediately left for the consulting world and Mark was a student of mine back in his days of University of Winnipeg. I guess I am getting old. I'm going to roar through these three questions here and leave you with my own thoughts.

First of all, I think we need to recognize that there is two parallel and sometimes conflicting realities in parks. One is that there is the mandate and need to manage and co-ordinate and deliver the system while you're short of

dollars, short of manpower and short of time. Also, a second reality creates frustration in the field. That reality is to try and balance the need to plan and evaluate and protect the system. It's a weighty task, there's no question, and I want to spend some time on that today. Yet, it seems to me that you really are in a unique and very privileged position working with parks. That's because it seems to me that Parks represents a commitment and an obligation and a statement to future generations. Really, parks and Parks Branch represents and reflects the institutionalization of our values towards cultural and natural systems and the objects of natural and cultural heritage worth. As a society, we have said yes, this is a good thing. We have institutionalized and put by way of Acts and manpower and mandate, the implementation of what society sees as an important worth. Our commitment to the public good is our dedication of public places for public purposes. When we cut through all of the concepts of trying to balance utilization and preservation and recreation use and resource protection, we come down to a final premise, that while others such as urban and regional governments can provide for public recreation use, few have demonstrated an equal commitment to a long-term natural and cultural system preservation and protection and it behooves Manitoba Parks Branch to lead. That has always been my biased view of the role of the Provincial Parks system, i.e. to ensure that the future is delivered, an intact, representative, meaningful complete parks system. And your job is to deliver that for myself, my children and my grandchildren.

So, it seems to me that these areas then, whatever we call them by way of classification, are really there to serve, and I'm serious about this, the future soul of mankind, the basic scientific interests of research, and that we all have an obligation to the natural world and our cultural roots combined. The Provincial Parks system should represent nothing less than the institutionalized commitment to an environment that plays a vital role in the well being of both the natural world and humankind. So you say, oh, there's Witty again, sounds to ominous to me. Well, I suggest to you, consider the value you place on Banff and the mountain parks which were dedicated a hundred years ago. Hopefully in a hundred years from now, people will look back, they won't

know who you were, but they can look at the work you've done and say, "well done!"

So the question then is, "will future generations be able to point to similar leadership in Manitoba?", and the answer had better be "yes". So what does the Branch stand for? Well, the Branch is the embodiment of our commitment to balance economic developments with sensitivity to environment. That notion has been the seed of sustainable development. That comes out of a lot of the work that park agencies have done. Now obviously this commitment does not negate the need to undertake environmentally sensitive development at urban and regional, provincial and national scales through sound land use planning and development and enforcement of environmental control regulations. But the role of Parks Branch is more pro-active to the extent that it directly plans and administers lands for the special purpose of securing long-term cultural and natural resource integrity. It is a weighty mandate, no question.

What is the relevance and value of Provincial Parks? Well, personally, I view Provincial Parks as society's embodiment of its desire to give recognition to the significant role of our cultural and natural history. As time moves on, that belief becomes even firmer. I look around and see more hydro development. I'm not saying we don't need to do those things, but they're going to continue, no question. But, on the one hand we're getting more commitment to land through Repap., and hydro and highways, and we're opening up more areas, so we'd better get the system in place.

What I have seen in 20 years plus in Manitoba are really phenomenal changes. I look at the number of park lands we've dedicated, and you know, we need to speed up the process. I don't believe it's just through park dedication either. I'm going to come to some other opportunities. But for me, Parks Branch really plays a significant role in knowing that parks are just there and that they provide an opportunity factor. I may choose not to use the Bloodvein or I may. Fortunately, I've been down it twice, but what gives me solace is knowing it's there. What gives me solace is knowing that there are elk and that there will continue to be elk in Duck Mountain. What gives me solace is knowing that Beaudry will end up, hopefully, interpreting the prairie environment. Those are

important things to me, whether I use them or not. Professionally, Parks is part of a system approach to planning, that's what interests me as a planner. A system where Parks is attempting to meet its mandate, other agencies are attempting to meet their mandate. The need, it seems to me, is to integrate all levels; urban, regional, provincial and federal park systems into some common effort and common mandate so we don't end up duplicating each other or using scarce resources in competition.

So what are the challenges and opportunities. These words, and I'm going to address them very quickly. Compromise is a challenge and an opportunity. Management innovation - a challenge and opportunity. Integrative holistic planning - a challenge and an opportunity as are marketing, sustainable development and change in clientele. So I'm just going to go through these briefly.

The word compromise is a favourite management and political word. The challenge of compromise is that it can be used to water down things. It's a handy thing that backs you in a corner. Come on, can't you compromise on this? And with all due respect to tourism, that's an area where I see some potential problems in the future. We may be pushed into situations where we compromise for tourism development for the sake of the resource that was initially set aside. On the other hand, compromise offers all kinds of opportunities because it can provide the ability to broaden the park movement and look at what's happening on private land. We must recognize that we should start to not just focus on land that's bordered with Parks Branch ownership if you will, but look at the land adjacent to it, and start to do some serious integrative planning. Beaudry is a good example of combining stewardship on private land with public land.

Management innovation, the great MBA phraseology. That's a scary one in many ways because it pushes a lot of people who want to hold to a particular position and basically says, look, management innovation is the new thing. We have to be flexible, we have to adapt. Come on guys, get on board. Well that's great. And I think there are many cases where you should be able to do that.

Unfortunately though, sometimes you have to take a hard line position. On the other hand though, management innovation can provide the ability to broaden the ways of achieving the goals of Parks Branch by responding to legitimate needs and change without compromising the values and intent. It's a very important concept, I think. And we have to always be flexible, but we shouldn't be flexible for flexibility's sake and because certain buzz words are in.

Integrative holistic planning. Well, planning is sometimes viewed as the panacea to our problems. The challenge there is to recognize that Parks cannot be all things to all people. And that we shouldn't try and always achieve multiple resource use. It's just not appropriate sometimes. The challenge is to know when to fight. To fight for key issues and when to be flexible and recognize that other important uses hold sway. The opportunity is to undertake through integrative holistic planning, as I call it, this integrative parks system approach where the Feds sit down with the Province and you talk about what's happening in Manitoba, and whose going to do what and let's get on with it. It's an opportunity to broaden our view beyond park boundaries and recognize that the success of island parks such as Riding Mountain, in the case of the Feds, or Spruce Woods in the case of the province. The island park must be viewed in a broader regional context or they're going to fail biologically in the long term.

Sustainable development. Can you define it? Well, it's a new catch phrase that is poorly understood and even more poorly applied. It is a phrase capable of manipulation for the wrong reasons. And I'm already seeing that in the consulting side through some clients. But, the opportunity is to really properly apply a lot of the kind of basics that Parks Branch has held, the philosophy it's held for a long time. So it does offer a major opportunity, I agree with Jim.

Marketing. New buzz word. It's a catch-all. The challenge is that it's a catch-all way of further compromising mandates by selling resource commodities rather than promoting resources. And there's a difference there. So it's important to recognize the need to stay in tune with what is happening

beyond the parks system. That's the challenge though. You can't isolate yourself. What's going on in the real world? You need the support politically, and you need the support from the public. The opportunity then, from a marketing point of view, is an increasingly important way of promoting what parks are all about. It's critical to the future well being of the movement, and you must market the product and your mandate. You've got to make people aware of what it is you're trying to do.

The changing clientele is the one last challenge and opportunity. You'd better look now because boy is it ever changing out there. The challenges to provide recreation opportunities for the increased diversity of clientele that exists; senior, disabled, non-Caucasians. To instill in new Canadians a sense of pride and purpose in parks, you'd better get on with that one because I can see that as a growing issue. Culturally, what do parks mean to new cultures that are coming to the country? The opportunity, if done right, is to greatly expand the receptive audience and sell the program. So, the greatest opportunities relate to this; One, latching on to the increased environmental movement and attempting to tie basic concerns of pollution, the back door syndrome, to the need to commit lands and resources, which tend to be far away for parks. There's a link there that can be made, and it better be made, because while we may take comfort and solace in the fact we've got a public that's really environmentally conscious, the fact is, that as the issues move away from the back door, consciousness decreases. That's the reality. You've got to make that strong link. The greatest challenge will come from incremental pressures sustained over the years to make allowance for current needs and demands and trendy things, i.e. the short-term view as opposed to the long term, and the incredible future competition for land. As I say, you ain't seen nothing yet. You think there's competition for land now. It's coming and a lot stronger.

So, I advise you to remember the three basic park principles. I like these ones. "Concept of irreplaceability"; when you lose the resource, it's gone. "Concept of irreversibility"; once you start a process, particularly in the biological field, it's hard to change it back. When you start making decisions, compromises and changes that may appear to have some short-term gain,

it could be long-term pain. The "concept of substitutability" and that is, quite literally, that you don't always have to develop the prime resource to satisfy public demand. There's been so much research in this area. People will take well designed, well planned, reasonable resource base as substitute for the premier resource. No question. And that's an important one.

In the end, it's important to remember that parks are here forever and represent our commitment today, to that future. Our commitment is to set aside cultural and natural and recreation resources for the public good of today, tomorrow and the future. You really are fortunate to be part of that opportunity and mandate. I leave you with this; you need to develop your vision based on dreams and reality and work towards its fulfilment within the opportunities supported by what are becoming very dramatic changes in times. Thanks.

7.3 Hubert Meseman - Director, Tourist Branch

I've just come back from Toronto where I spent a day and a half with the conference board. Their economic forecast for tourism and what the future holds isn't all that rosy. I want to share some of the research, trends in tourism, both global and local. Many of these impact parks and lead to some non-definitive answers to the questions that you posed to us. Before I do that, it's valuable to give you an overview on tourism, both globally and in Canada, and in our province.

It's interesting to note that most economists and futurists feel that tourism will be the largest industry in the world, probably by the year 2000. Receipts in tourism have grown somewhere in the neighbourhood of 60% on a worldwide basis, over the last seven years alone. There appears to be nothing on the horizon that's going to change that trend in terms of people internationally wanting to travel. How they travel and where they travel is the challenge that faces us. There's a shift in the travel patterns internationally, and it's very similar to what you see in the economic sphere in that, the so-called industrialized countries, are no longer holding all the cards. The travel patterns to the Asia-Pacific, to the eastern block countries, and to Africa are

stronger and stronger all the time. That means that North America isn't the number one international destination anymore.

In Canada, we've done quite well, although there are major concerns in the industry right now insofar as what the future holds for inbound travel and, indeed, for domestic travel for Canadians travelling in Canada. Canadians are going out more than they're staying here. Up to now, it's been quite good. We are now a $24 billion business in Canada. Tourism has become the second largest earner of foreign exchange, outside of the automobile industry. It's been a growth industry and a relatively rosy picture to now. The conference board spent most of its time, yesterday and the day before, talking about the implications of G.S.T., and some of the things happening federally and provincially in governments that may cloud the future of tourism insofar as our capacity to attract tourists, both from a physical plan side and from a marketing and promotion side.

Our provincial statistics albeit were growing from some real losses over the last ten years, but we are much better in the national average, up to the end of August this year, with a 7% growth of United States visitation, contrary to a 4% decline for all of Canada. Manitoba is actually, at the moment, the highest. We're not highest overall because our domestic growth and offshore growth is down as well. Tourism for 1988 is an $869 million dollar business in the province, and employs some 25,000 people. Parks are an integral part of this and are lumped into the national tourism figures that show businesses and employment.

We are spending a little more money in our efforts, both developmentally with infrastructure, and on the marketing side. We've had the benefit of a $30 million federal-provincial agreement, $5 million of that that I handle in the marketing side. It's allowed us to, first of all, identify the voids in the tourism product. The void doesn't lie in the parks area. It's elsewhere. The void is in bricks and mortar, in accommodations and attractions. Our departmental marketing budget is $3¼ million. The lion's share of that is spent very close to home. Our generic advertising and promotion campaigns reach

a 500-mile radius around the City of Winnipeg, and that's where 90% of our traffic comes from. We go further afield when we deal with what we loosely term our specialty products, and Parks does fit into that in a loose fashion. We deal with the meetings and convention industry differently. Fishing and hunting are dealt with differently, and we go further afield for our clients for that.

Outdoor recreation or outdoor adventure is the non-consumptive product we have. It's a catch-all phrase for everything from canoeing to camping to wildlife viewing, hiking and photography. Churchill gets lumped into that because it's a very attractive destination to see bears, and birding is very strong there. We definitely feel there is a lot more opportunity in those product areas to go well beyond what I just described as that 500-mile radius for our primary markets.

That's about the most capsulized tourism review I could give you. I did it intentionally so that I could address tourism trends, attitudinal trends, consumer trends and some economic trends summarized from the work of the conference board. Earlier in the year, I was at a session where one of the American gurus, who was an advisor to Ronald Reagan, spoke about the American renaissance in the year 2000, and what the future held for the United States. I'm going to quote from the "Yanklovic Monitor", a consumer attitude research journal out of New York. Most of these are very up to date and I think many have implications for parks.

I've already described the first, that tourism is a global marketplace, i.e. a package from the United States to Churchill is competing with anything else in the world. You can get price-competitive packages to the Asia-Pacific. You can do a week in Singapore for the same price that you can do a week in Churchill or one of the more northern parks if you're using commercial accommodations. Included with that is the international competition that it's bringing to Canada to sustain our efforts to keep tourists here. Now a few numbers on marketing budgets. The United States is spending somewhere around $250 million, counting state money, to promote travel to the United States. The UK is spending about $58 million, not counting their regions. Italy outspends

us, and on and on. Unfortunately, because of deficits, we're losing marketing dollars. Tourism Canada is committed to dropping their $25 million marketing budget by $5 million a year over the next while. That's a scary thought when we are dealing in a globally competitive environment. Our parks, similarly, are competing with hiking in the Himalayas, competing with Africa, with Asia, and that determines how we have to position ourselves.

Growing environmental consciousness is the biggie, particularly in tourism in the industrialized world. The gondoliers in Venice are wearing masks. People are no longer able to use some of the hotbeds for travel because lakes and forests are being polluted or depleted. The public consciousness is very, very strong. Canada, and particularly Manitoba, is well positioned in this regard. My personal view and research opinion is that clean and clear water may well be the biggest product that we have in the future.

The greater urban concentrations in industrialized countries are influencing travel. Crowding and stress levels in Asia and Europe are having an impact on people deciding where they're going to go and what they're going to do. That is positive for parks. The need to get away to open spaces, peace and quiet, will play a great part in people's travel decisions.

One new interesting fact is that a CBS attitude time poll indicated travellers are interested in experiences rather than things. This is related to demographics and a more mature market. People are quality conscious, they want experiences - frequently educational experiences, but soft education. They don't want necessarily a lecture. When they travel, they want to learn about the location's heritage, culture and history. That is becoming stronger and stronger. The tourism industry hasn't spent enough time on that. They are still dealing with building attractions, so put a lawn chair out on the beach and you've got a product but, that isn't so anymore. That has implications to parks.

There are tendencies to shorter holidays. I remember when I went through phys. ed. and recreation. The buzz word was that there is going to be

more and more leisure time. Now the Harris poll says that from 1973 to 1987, the industrialized countries lost leisure time. Consequently, people will be very selective about what they do with their leisure time. The shorter holidays are a result of the stress of having two working people in the family. They say, "we've got to get the heck out of here", and go for three days. It's incredible that people will go for five days where they used to go for a month. They'll travel long hauls just to have that getaway experience. They don't want to get buzzed with people. This applies most prominently to Asia and Europe. There is a growing interest in heritage and culture. For parks, it means opportunities for programming the historical sites, and local folklore is very important. There are now more traditional villages developed in the United States, and to a smaller degree here. I had the privilege of going up to the Northwest Territories and seeing what is being done in the Inuit communities. It isn't real, it's a bit of crass commercialism, but to the visitor it's very real. We have opportunities here with Native culture, but it could mean a lot of work. The market represents strong interests.

In the industrialized countries, seniors will become more prominent. This can reduce seasonal demand. In spite of all those good numbers I threw at you, tourism is viewed, even by reports for the federal government, as a ninety-day wonder. It doesn't have the same stature as other industries simply because you can't really influence the seasonality much. What you see is what you get. That's what we're trying to shift. With the seniors and the aging population, seasonality becomes less of a problem in that there are two markets, an upscale market and a very price-sensitive market. I think there is a message there for parks.

There is shifting in ethnic populations. In Canada and the U.S., there are growing immigrant populations and ethnic groups that haven't been addressed in the marketing sense or in research to identify what kind of products that new population is after. I think those have implications for what will happen in the tourism product, in general, and in parks, specifically.

The question was asked, how we get economic development with sensitivity to sustaining the natural resource. That's the greatest challenge. My area is much more commercial, but it has to be addressed in a way that we're meeting the needs of our own society. Number one, Manitobans must have opportunities and experiences in their parks. But furthermore, we must deal with customers from abroad in an effective manner. Growth should be positive for all parties.

I see endless opportunities in parks. I know that we're not equipped yet. We're doing research on wildlife viewing at the present time and we're looking at packaging of our outdoor product. The statistics of use for things like birding are just overwhelming. We haven't taken advantage of that product. The non-consumptive use of our wonderful resource can create economic growth, but really doesn't damage the environment. Also, with proper planning and marketing, the province could do more with development of four-season resorts. I say that reservedly, but I feel that there can be some further growth there. We have some of the best canoeing and rafting. There have been some small attempts on whitewater rafting. That is more of an infrastructure and development thing. We are looking for more operators with entrepreneurial spirit, in the private sector, for people who are reasonably well financed and experienced to carry that product and sell it. We get incredible worldwide canoeing demand because we do have wonderful experiences in canoeing, but the limitation is the outfitters and the professionalism in the private sector to provide the proper experiences. Bed and breakfast, country inns are used in connection with trail riding and ranching. All kinds of things that can happen.

I want to close this with just a personal note as a long-time user of parks. I took a busman's holiday in September, travelled about 3,000 kilometres, predominantly in parks. I took my bike, hiked and roamed around. It was wonderful. I'll do it again next year with my wife. The most disconcerting thing for me, from the professional side, was that it was mid-September, the weather was beautiful, there were no bugs, the colours at their best, but I didn't see a soul. I saw some hunters in the Duck Mountains, and there were conventioneers in the two major resorts. Beyond that, I owned the parks. I'd

like to keep it that way, for me personally, but it's not the right way to go. I walked away from there, as a marketing guy, with a "remember September" ad campaign. I think that alone can turn around the economy. I think the future is very good if we do it right and plan it right. Thank you.

7.4 Mark Searle - Professor of Recreation Studies, University of Manitoba

I can't tell you how appreciative I am to be here and, thank you, Gord, for letting me go last. These will be exceptionally short remarks. They used to say in Alberta, "if you don't strike oil in ten minutes, stop boring." I try and live by that.

Let me tell you a story to begin. I spent part of my education in the United States, and had an opportunity to spend a fair amount of time, also, in the Carolinas. They used to tell a story about a preacher who would go from town to town, as is common in that part of the country, because communities couldn't sustain having their own preacher. He would start every sermon with, "why are we all here?" He would go through the ten commandments, a little fire and brimstone, and go through the whole business. He got to this one community and he did his sermon. He was out afterwards and they were thanking him for coming, talking with the community. And they said, "you know Reverend, we have mental hospitals here and they rarely ever get a religious service. Would you be so kind and come up and deliver a religious service?" He said, "I'd love to." So, they assembled the masses in the hospital. He stands at the front of the room and says, "why are we all here?" The guy at the back of the room goes, "because we're not all there."

We're not all there in terms of the resources that we should have in the jurisdiction of the Parks Branch. I think we're moving positively. I think the attention to environmental issues is a healthy thing. I think the changes that Jim and Dave were talking about in terms of the opportunity is very important.

For me, the parks system is an important element in our efforts to preserve part of our past, to provide opportunities for outdoor recreation and, perhaps, most importantly, to ensure the preservation of our future. The parks system represents an opportunity for certain types of experiences I can't get anywhere else. It's a chance for me to take my children to see and experience nature in a manner they can't possibly get being urban dwellers living in a suburban area, where the biggest piece of land they see is their back yard. It's an opportunity to learn about the environment, my impact on it, and to pass on the significance of parks and natural areas to my children. I can't conceive of living in a place where public policy excludes the establishment and management of outdoor spaces, which represent the spectrum of opportunity you have currently in your system, and hope to have when the system is complete.

But the world is a changing place. Values are changing toward work, leisure, many other things we used to hold near and dear which used to be standard and unchanging. We live in a world of transience, not one of permanence. I was thinking about this as I was preparing for today, that "Future Shock", which everybody likes to think back of as the book that set us on the wave or the trend of the future in thinking about change, was written 20 years ago. Toffler stated that the only thing we were going to have in society that's constant, is change. Change is our stable commodity. Well, we are those people of the future. We are the people living in the age of transience. Certainly, if we've worked in government for any length of time, we've become used to this. Government follows the Quigley law of organizations. "Any system that works perfectly will be revised." I speak from extensive practical experience in that regard. So, we must be sure that in the face of this changing environment, the Parks system isn't changed for the sake of change, nor is it changed without regard for the long term.

One of the dangers of change, in recent years, has been the tendency to be more inward looking rather than concerned with the larger picture. I'll tell you another story that Paul Stookie tells from Peter, Paul and Mary. I'm glad to see that you're mostly older people so you know who they are. It can be frustrating at the university sometimes trying to tell stories about things,

or if their only connection to Peter, Paul and Mary is from their day camp experience.

Paul Stookie tells this story when they were in concert, and that is about how things have changed and this concern about being inward looking. He gives you an analogy. In the 1950's, the quintessential magazine that defined for us everything that "was", was "Life" magazine. "Life" was everything. It covered absolutely every topic imaginable. Those of you who remember getting it, remember the wonderful pictures that "Life" would have for us. In the 1960's, we were delivered "People" magazine. The focus got a littler bit more narrow. It started to look just like all of us. In the 1970's, the magazine that hit the newsstands was called "Us". Things are shrinking. In the 1980's, if you're in Safeway and you're at the checkout stand, you can buy "Self". These aren't made up, folks. The scary part is that the 1990's may hold for us a magazine called "Me", with nothing more than 20 pages of foil that you open up and you look at yourself. We have to be concerned about that kind of view. We have to make sure that the "Life" magazine view gives us the option we head for and the lesser alternatives we try to avoid.

As managers of the Parks system, you might be characterized as the "stewards of access" and the "custodians of choice", which is a phrase coined by some Minnesotans. This characterization suggests that you have an important responsibility to ensure that the parks system achieves its mission, and satisfies the needs for outdoor recreation space and conservation and preservation of important ecological areas. This means, as professionals, you must strive to maintain your professional beliefs and philosophies. You must communicate it clearly to our elected representatives so that they have the highest quality advice. As your director said earlier this morning, don't get discouraged when decisions are taken which are inconsistent with your recommendations. Let it stick in your resolve and increase your commitment. Don't give up the ship. How do you maintain your energy in the face of what sometimes seems like insurmountable obstacles?

Well, first you've got to remember that, for many of us, and I treat myself as the public rather than, perhaps, the expert. I mean, I'm a park user. I don't teach much about parks, personally. That's not my area of expertise or background. For many of us in the public, the only knowledge we have, as it relates to issues of parks or parks management, are those we get through the media. For 90% of the public, that media is television, which tells you that they're getting about 90 seconds at a time. That's not a lot of information. Therefore, you are the essential element in ensuring that decisions that are taken are well-founded, not short term or ill conceived. That's a critical role. We have to rely on you to pass on the kind of quality advice that's going to ensure that decisions taken reflect the long-term development.

Second, and this has been alluded to earlier; you must accept the role as educator. You must expand and develop, where necessary, activities which broaden the understanding among the general public and key decision makers. It's your responsibility to act as advocates, and you must use all the resources at your disposal to have quality information shared and debated. Don't let decisions be made in a vacuum. I'm not suggesting here, a recipe for subversion of the democratic process, and that you're somehow going to undermine your elected leaders. Nor is it an aggregation of your responsibilities as a public servant. In fact, I think it's quite the contrast. I think your job is to ensure that the best information is available so that the best decision can be made. In considering the fact that governments increasingly rely on public opinion to shape their actions, you've got to become a player in shaping that public opinion. You can't simply rely on pronouncements from time to time about the values of parks, and the putting out of occasional blurbs. That simply won't get the message to "who" it has to get to. If you don't do this, your job is going to become increasingly difficult, and we're all going to suffer from having less than an optimal parks system.

Let me talk about some challenges. The first one, I think, is to accommodate the changing demands for the parks system, and ensure the opportunities are made available for different types of users. To this extent, I think the parks system has to expand to develop within urban areas. I think

you should be coming very active in the urban parks area in terms of recreation trailways, parkways, waterways, and heritage parks. This serves the dual purpose of expanding the user base and, thus, the pool of advocates, and improving the quality of life for urban residents who, either by circumstance or other limitation, cannot take advantage of parks outside their community.

The number of users is diminishing in some areas. There needs to be closer examination of why this is occurring. The older adult explosion changes have been talked about. I don't know how many of you know this, but over 22% of Manitobans are now over 55. That explosion isn't about to happen, it has happened. How are these over-55 year olds different from the previous group who was in that age group? How does their behaviour differ? What are their expectations in the parks? How will the next group differ? The baby boomers, as they turn 55 and 60 and 65? I suspect there is going to be great changes in what they expect to get, and there is going to be greater demands on you to educate them as to what they might reasonably expect, and what are the roles and missions of a parks system.

Second, I think that the challenge you've got is to expand the landholdings of the branch. This has been talked about before in terms of completing the system.

Third, I think you need to educate the public and the decision makers. The expansion into urban areas would be a key asset. You've got to recognize you have to develop multiple information dissemination techniques (an academic phrase). One of the things you can do, and it's very important, is to work collaboratively, not only with other government departments that have interests, like Culture, Heritage and Recreation and Tourism, but I think one of the most important departments you should be working with is the Department of Education. You should be in the school system from K to 12 talking about kinds of values that you're promoting in the parks system. I think that you have to continue to sustain the system we have in the face of demands for other uses of the system. While cottagers have their rights and cottagers are important, and

resource harvesting has a role, they've got to be kept in perspective, and they are not among, in my opinion, the top perspectives.

Fourth, I think that you need to keep control of the parks within the jurisdiction of the public sector. Nothing galls me more than to have discussions about privatization of parks. I think it is a sad situation and, while I emphasize from a marketing point of view, the problems of having low attendance in September, or low attendance in some parks, I don't believe that, that in and of itself, is a negative feature. We don't create parks solely for the sake of having people to go through them. They serve a variety of purposes. We want people to go through them. We want them to benefit by them, but they benefit in many ways, not just by having to be there.

Fifth and lastly, I want to say in terms of a challenge, that I think you've got to be cautious not to allow the justification of the Parks system to become reliant on economic reasons alone. Nor should that be the principle factor for the system. Increasingly, I hear discussions about the economics of parks as the true benefit, that the whole issue of park planning, park management is surrounding economies of scale, and so forth. Economics has a role. I'm not one to suggest it doesn't. And certainly parks do contribute to certain very specific parts of our province, and to the provincial economy as a whole. However, the economics can't be our raison d'être. The parks system exists for social and environmental reasons. As soon as we start to make our case on economics, we can expect to die by the same argument. And if we're going to make the case on economics, I suggest then what you should be doing is building major tourist attractions in every park you have because that's where you'll make sure that you make the biggest impact. If you try and do it any other way, you're going to die in terms of the economic issue. If you go the economics route, all you're doing is creating a less than healthy system. I think the principle opportunity you have is the chance to capitalize on the changing public opinion about the threats to our environment. I agree that the issues of sustainable development and the change in public attitude may diffuse attention to parks issues in and of themselves. But I think what it also does is increase an

enormous group of people who are willing to support environmental issues whatever they be. And I think that's a healthy situation.

I think that these things will allow you to continue to look towards expansion of the system, hopefully to complete the system that you have now, and to expand it even beyond that. Thank you very much.

8.0 FOLLOW-UP

In addition to providing an opportunity for staff to meet and participate in formulating the Parks Branch agenda for the '90's, the conference also permitted us to get to know one another a bit better.

However, the test of success will be in what happens over the next couple of years. It will have been a success if:

1. Our much talked about discussion paper sees the light of day and is reviewed publicly, with The Provincial Park Lands Act revised to reflect these discussions.
2. Our Parks System Plan is updated and approved by Cabinet.
3. The Parks Branch continues to function as a team and, by doing so, we improve inter/intra-branch communications and service to clients.
4. The branch is seen to employ the principles contained in the Management Philosophy.
5. "Remember September" comes to pass.

APPENDIX I - ORGANIZING VOLUNTEERS

Chairman	-	Bruce Bremner
Organizing Committee	-	Rose Green, Gord Jones, John Irwin, Kent Goldie, Roger Schroeder, Willard Anderson, Bruce Bremner
Logistics	-	Peter Hunchak, Cheryl Reynolds
Pre-conference Kits	-	Karen Sim, John McFarland
Technical Equipment	-	Jim Tallosi, Bill Anderson
Social Committee	-	Jeff Colpitts, Pat Johnston, Kent Goldie, Bruce Bremner
Printing & Graphics	-	Bryan Spulnick, Erich Friedle
Conference Proceedings	-	Darlene Ransome, Willard Anderson